

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. VIII.

OCTOBER 1904.

No. 4.

A CATECHISM ON MEMBERSHIP IN THE ORDER OF THE KNIGHTS OF PYTHIAS.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.—How long have you been a member of this order? Why did you join the order? To provide for yourself and family in case of sickness and death is certainly proper and right. See 1 Tim. 5, 8. But is joining a lodge a proper and right way of doing this? That is the question. I am convinced that it is not a proper and right way. I am convinced that membership in your organization is forbidden by God and, therefore, sinful and wrong. As your pastor it is my sacred duty to instruct you and to endeavor to bring you to a knowledge of the sinfulness of your lodge connection. I take it for granted that you do not see any wrong in belonging to the lodge, otherwise you would abandon it. I have this confidence in you that you would not knowingly continue in sin. But why don't you see any wrong in it? Because you do not see the real, true character of your order. It is this character, the un-Christian and anti-Christian character of your organization, which we oppose. We do not attack the character of the men belonging to it, but the character, principles, and purposes of the order, of the system. We do not deny that there are good men in your lodge. You say that even ministers belong to it. This may be another reason why you can see no wrong in your lodge connection. But need I tell you that not men but Christ is our exemplar and teacher?

Does not the Bible say "that ye should follow His steps"? And does not our Savior Himself say to us, "Learn of me"? And what does He teach us concerning lodges? He teaches us that it is sinful to belong to them. He says unto us, "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate." It is true, the word "lodge" is not to be found in the Bible, but the Bible constantly cautions us against those very things which are constantly found in the lodge. Because the Bible is against the lodge, we are against it, and would oppose it even if no other churches would do so. But ours is by no means the only church that bears witness against lodgism. Look at the following testimonies of non-Lutherans:

1. BAPTISTS. *The Baptist Church Directory*: "It may be said that whether these societies are good or bad in themselves . . . connection with them will be a grief to many, and it is, at best, of very questionable propriety; the safer course, by far, is to avoid them altogether."—Rev. Nathaniel Colvert, who with others organized the Tremont Temple Baptist Church in Boston: "All members of Baptist churches of the same faith and order, in good standing, are invited to participate with us; except . . . members of secret associations; to such the invitation is not extended."—The late Rev. A. J. Gordon, D. D.: "Membership in the secret lodge is certainly incompatible with usefulness in the Christian church. . . . The heart cannot be halved; and he that attempts to love the Church of God with one hemisphere of his heart, and the secret society with the other, will speedily find that he is very much more of a lodgeman than a churchman." "They tell us to spare this or that secret order, but it will not do. They are all organized on a false basis of morality, and our eye must not spare, any more than did Samuel when he slew Agag."—Rev. S. P. Henson: "We are often told in vaunting speech of the illustrious names that have given their sanction to secret societies. No matter for that—the name of Jesus is

above every name, and His name is recorded in reprobation of them."

2. CONGREGATIONALISTS. Samuel Adams, the father of the American Revolution: "I am decidedly opposed to all secret societies whatever."—Rev. Prof. C. G. Finney: "When I became a Christian, I had to forsake my lodge sin as I forsook my other sins."—Dwight L. Moody: "I do not see how any Christian, most of all a Christian minister, can go into these secret lodges with unbelievers."

3. METHODISTS. John Wesley: "What an amazing banter upon all mankind is Freemasonry!"—Rev. B. F. Roberts: "To be a good Mason and a good Christian at the same time would be treason to Christ."—President U. S. Grant: "All secret, oath-bound political parties are dangerous to any nation."—The *International Cyclopaedia*: "Wesleyan Methodists . . . exclude from their fellowship all members of secret societies."

4. PRESBYTERIANS. Rev. Howard Crosby: "We have no hesitation in writing secret societies among the quackeries of the earth. Whatever in them is not babyish is dangerous."

Such testimonies might be multiplied *ad infinitum*; but these will suffice to show that there are many Christians outside our church who account the lodge an institution with which no follower of Jesus Christ should have any connection. With the help of God I will now endeavor to bring you to the same knowledge. I believe that a catechisation will be the easiest and most successful way of accomplishing this. I will, therefore, ask a series of simple questions which you will kindly answer. The purpose of this catechisation is not to receive knowledge from you, but to impart knowledge to you. Nor is it my purpose to pump secrets out of you. If you should fear, however, that you would disclose secrets by answering the one or the other question, we will let others answer for you. Let us begin, then, in God's name.

**A Catechism on Membership in the Order of the
Knights of Pythias.**

I.

1. Was the obligation which you took a simple promise, or was it a promissory oath? (*Note: If it is at once acknowledged that the obligation is an oath, questions 2 to 5 are to be omitted.*)

2. Were you obligated on the Bible?

3. You were blindfolded and required to kneel upon both knees before an open coffin containing a skeleton. On that coffin two swords were crossed with the points toward you. On those swords was an open Bible called the book of law. You placed your left hand upon your left breast and your right hand, palm downward, on the book of law. In this position you took the obligation. Now tell me, please, is it not an outward form or sign of appealing to the Author of the Bible in an oath when a person thus places his right hand on the Bible?

4. Again, you said at the end of each obligation: "So help me God—and may He keep me steadfast." Does not this solemn appeal to God plainly stamp those obligations as oaths?

5. The Chancellor Commander says to the page: "These heroes still live, and will live while friendship warms the heart of man. This virtue is the corner-stone of the order, and our members are sworn to exercise it toward each other." Isn't this a plain admission that your members are sworn, that they are put under oath?

6. Do you see any wrong in having taken that obligation or oath?

7. In those oaths you used God's name. What does God say in the Second Commandment concerning His name?

8. What is meant by this?

9. When only may we swear by God's name?

10. Let us examine your lodge oath according to this rule. Did the glory of God demand it that you solemnly

called on His name to help you never to reveal the password, grip, signs, or any other secret or mystery of the various ranks, to obey the laws of the order—did the glory of God demand this?

11. Would it have been detrimental to the glory of God if you had not taken such an oath?

12. On the other hand, did the welfare of your neighbor demand it that you were sworn to exercise charity toward him?

13. According to the Bible, then, your oath was unnecessary, was it not?

14. Didn't you take God's name in vain, then?

15. Moreover, you know that all oaths in uncertain things are forbidden. Did you know the password, grip, secret work, or mystery at the time when you solemnly promised never to reveal them?

16. You solemnly promised to obey the laws of the order. Did you positively know in advance that they were laws which God would allow you to obey?

17. Was it right before God to take such an oath in uncertain things?

18. That oath was wrong, therefore, in every way.—I believe it that you did not know this at the time. You erred in ignorance. But is ignorance of the law an excuse?

19. Does not the Bible say: "The Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh His name in vain"?

20. How, then, may you get rid of this guilt?

21. But suppose a person sees that he has sinned, and asks God to forgive him, but will not forsake that sin, can such a person have mercy?—"He that covereth his sins shall not prosper: but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy," Prov. 28, 13.

22. What must you do, then, to obtain mercy?

II.

1. According to the laws of the Knights of Pythias of the State of Missouri (p. 184), one of the objects and purposes of this organization is to provide for the relief of its

members. You certainly do not believe that we condemn this object and purpose?

2. God wants us to love even our enemies and to do good unto all men, even to the ungodly and unbelieving—does He not?

3. But love is, as you may know, of two kinds. There is a love which is essentially affection. It takes pleasure and delight in a person and longs for union and communion with him. The other is essentially pity, compassion, benevolence. Do you suppose that God wants us Christians to love the ungodly with delight and affection, to long for fellowship of heart and soul with them?

4. Does God want us believers to have intimate fellowship with unbelievers?

God has most earnestly forbidden such fellowship in many Bible passages. See Ps. 1 and comp. Ps. 26, 4; 139, 20—23. Is. 52, 11. Rom. 16, 17. James 4, 4. Rev. 18, 4. 2 Chron. 19, 1—3. 2 Cor. 6, 14—18, and many other passages. Let us read and examine the last-named passage: "*Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.*"

5. Who says this?

6. To whom does the Lord say: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers"?

7. What does it mean to be "yoked together" with unbelievers?

8. With whom shall we believers not be intimately connected?

9. What kind of an intimate union or yoking together is it when believers are yoked together with unbelievers?

10. What does God, therefore, say in verse 27?

11. Can you misunderstand such plain language?

12. Let us now read the instructive story of an unequal union of a believer with an unbeliever. Read 2 Chron. 18, 1—3.

13. Who was Jehoshaphat? See 2 Chron. 17, 3—6.

14. Do you remember who Ahab was?

15. Jehoshaphat was a believer, while Ahab was an unbeliever. Still, what did Jehoshaphat do, according to 2 Chron. 18, 1—3?

16. What did God say to Jehoshaphat because of this unequal union with Ahab? See 2 Chron. 19, 1. 2.

17. What lesson does this story teach us?

18. Are there any unbelievers in your order?

19. Yes, I know that a belief in the existence of a Supreme Being is one of the qualifications for membership. But do not the devils also believe that there is a God? See James 2, 19.

20. But does this belief that there is a God, a Supreme Being, make the devils true believers or Christians?

21. The Bible says, "That all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father. He that honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father which hath sent Him." And again: "Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father." Now, you know that the Jews, Unitarians, and others deny the Son. Are these believers, then, or unbelievers?

22. Are there not such unbelievers in your order, men who do not honor the Son, but deny Him?

23. Let us look at the list of your membership. — So there are men in your order who by their profession or by their manner of life plainly show that they are unbelievers.

These may be honorable men, but believers they are not. — Now, does not your *Handbook* for the Order of the Knights of Pythias of Missouri say on page 8: "This is a benevolent Order, and has for its object the bringing together and binding together of a brotherhood of honorable men"?

24. Is this merely an object on paper, or does your order accomplish this object?

25. It certainly does. It brings together Jews and Gentiles, believers and unbelievers. These different classes of men sit together in the lodge room as brothers and friends; they sing together and pray together. Is that right?

26. Your order does not only purpose to bring men together, but also to bind them together. Does it endeavor to bind its members together in friendship?

27. Is friendship, as the *Handbook* says (p. 4), "the strongest bond of union between man and man"?

28. By this strongest bond of union all Knights of Pythias are bound together?

29. Are you also bound together with them by this strongest bond of union?

30. There are unbelievers in your order. To these as well as to the others you are bound, bound by the strongest bond of union between man and man. Do you see no wrong in this?

31. You asked God to help you exercise that "unexcelled and almost unequaled friendship" of Damon and Pythias toward every Knight of Pythias and thus also toward those members who deny your blessed Redeemer. Really, isn't that wrong?

32. You are unequally bound and yoked together with unbelievers while God says, "Be not unequally yoked together with unbelievers." Are you not disobeying your God?

33. God says, "Wherefore come out from among them." Will you stay with them when God says, "Come out from among them"?

34. Can you give me a definition of the verb "doubt"?
 —*Webster*: "To waver in opinion or judgment; to be in uncertainty as to belief respecting anything; to hesitate in belief; to be undecided as to the truth of the negative or affirmative proposition; to be undetermined." Doubt is opposed to faith, assured belief. Rom. 14, 23. Have you an assured belief that it is perfectly proper and right to belong to your lodge, or has the thought entered your mind that it might be wrong?

35. Let us read Rom. 14, 23.

36. How will this passage read if we substitute the words, "If he belong to the lodge," for the words, "If he eat"?

37. "*Whatsoever* is not of faith"—does that include lodge membership?

38. What is your lodge connection if it is not of faith?

39. What is said of him that doubts and yet eats?

40. What must be said of him that doubts whether it is perfectly proper and right to belong to the lodge, and yet joins it and stays in it?

But it seems to me that the two reasons which have been presented are so plain as to leave no room for doubt. They show, and show plainly, that a Christian should have nothing to do with the lodge. Still, our chief objection to lodgism has not been presented as yet. Let us proceed to it now.

III.

1. Did I understand you to say that there is nothing in your lodge that conflicts or interferes with your religion?

2. Your order has religious exercises, such as praying, singing, etc.?

3. The Bible says, "That all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father." Does your order honor the Son?

4. Doesn't that interfere with your religion?

5. Holy Writ says of the sweet name of Jesus: "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." But in order not to offend the Jew, this name is never once mentioned in all your printed prayers and odes. Really, doesn't that offend you? Doesn't that conflict with your religion?

6. Again, the Bible says: "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." But in compliment to the Jew this name which is above every name is persistently passed over in silence. Doesn't that outrage your Christian feeling?

7. An order that never once in all its printed prayers and odes mentions your dear Redeemer, but hides His ever-blessed name from view—is that a fit place for you?

8. Can a worship in which Christ has no place be a Christian worship?

9. If it is not a Christian worship, then, what kind of a service is it?

10. Must you not, to say the least, renounce that Christ-less religion and take no part in it?

But the order robs Christ of His honor in still another respect.

1. Can anyone get to heaven by his own good works?
2. Who is our Savior?
3. Wherefrom has Christ redeemed us?
4. Wherewith has Christ redeemed us?
5. Is there salvation in any other?
6. What must we do to be saved?
7. Who shall not be saved?

8. Does not your order teach that men can get to heaven by their own deeds?

9. Have you ever heard words similar to the following: "Keep sacred the lesson of to-night; and so live that when you come to the river that marks the unknown shore, your hands may be filled with deeds of charity, the golden keys that ope the palace of eternity"?

10. Should we fill our hands with deeds of charity?

11. But is it true that deeds of charity are "the golden keys that ope the palace of eternity"?

12. Will the person who imagines that his good deeds will open heaven for him enter into heaven?

13. St. Paul says: "For as many as are of the works of the Law are under the curse." Do you understand these words?

14. What is the fate of the person who imagines that his good deeds will open heaven for him?

15. Does your order expect its members to believe the statement that deeds of charity are "the golden keys that ope the palace of eternity"?

16. Is not the order thereby teaching a way of damnation?

17. Can you be and remain a member of, and give your moral and financial support to, an order which ignores Christ, the only Redeemer, and teaches that a person can open heaven by his own good works, and thereby leads people to destruction?

18. 'To withdraw from the lodge may mean a great deal to you. But can you be a disciple of Jesus, unless you deny yourself, and take up your cross, and follow Him?

19. 'To abandon the lodge may be tantamount to abandoning money. But what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?

20. What does God promise you if you come out from among them? See 2 Cor. 6, 18.

21. Shall you ever want if the Lord Almighty is a Father unto you?

I have now set before you God's command and promise. His command is plain and peremptory: "Come out from among them." Will you disobey it? His promise is persuasive and precious: "I will be a Father unto you." Will you disbelieve it? Do not confer with flesh and blood. Do not delay your decision. Act now. "Wherefore as the Holy Ghost saith: To-day if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts."

C. F. DREWES.

WILLIAM TYNDALE,

THE TRANSLATOR OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

(Concluded.)

Tyndale's Death in Holland.

King Henry sent Sir Thomas Elyot to the Continent to drag Tyndale to England, and for a time the Reformer wandered about in Germany to elude his pursuers, but later he again settled in Antwerp. In 1534 he reissued the Pentateuch and the revised second edition of the New Testament—"Tyndale's noblest monument." The prologues and glosses "have to a considerable extent been translated from the German of Luther." In 1535 Tyndale prepared yet another edition of the New Testament, with headings to chapters of the Gospels and the Acts, but without the marginal notes. It was a crime in any Englishman to sell, buy, or read a copy of the New Testament in his native tongue. A change was coming. Richard Herman, a merchant adventurer of Antwerp, was imprisoned for his "help to the setting forth of the New Testament in English." He appealed to Anne Boleyn, now Queen of Henry VIII, and in a letter to Thomas Cromwell she requested the release of the prisoner. And in gratitude for her favor, Tyndale struck off for her private use a copy of his New Testament on vellum, beautifully illuminated. Her name, in faded red

letters, may still be made out on the gilded edges of the book in the British Museum.

Ever since the middle of 1534 Tyndale had found a home with Thomas Poyntz at Antwerp in "The English House," granted to the English merchants with special privileges as far back as 1474. Tyndale also practiced what he preached: justification produced sanctification. "He reserved for himself two days in the week, which he named his days of pastime, namely, Monday and Saturday." The one of these was devoted to visiting all English refugees in the city and relieving their wants; on the other "he walked round about the town, seeking out every corner and hole where he suspected any poor person to dwell, and where he found any to be well occupied and yet overburdened with children, or else aged or weak, those also he plentifully relieved: and thus he spent his two days of pastime."

Rigorous laws were enacted year after year, in order to check, if possible, the progress of Lutheran doctrines. In October, 1529, Charles V ordained that the "reading, purchasing, or possessing any proscribed books, or any New Testaments prohibited by the theologians of Louvain; attendance at any meeting of heretics, disputing about Holy Scripture, want of due respect to the images of God and the Saints" were to be treated as crimes, for which "men were to be beheaded, women buried alive, and the relapsed burnt." In spite of these terrible measures, Lutheranism continued to make rapid progress in the Netherlands; and the Emperor, in revenge, issued fresh edicts, more severe than before. Informers were encouraged by the promise of a liberal reward, and a share in the confiscated goods of all convicted heretics; and, lest the government officials should be wanting in severity, it was ordered that all who were remiss should be reported and punished. The Inquisition was armed with full authority to seize all suspected persons, to try, to torture, to confiscate, to execute, without any right of appeal from their sentence; and these tyrannical

powers they exercised with relentless cruelty. Charles V was not one whit less ferocious than his son Philip II.

From these bloody measures Tyndale was free in the "English House," outside he had no protection. His enemies thirsted for his blood. Stephen Vaughan, the royal envoy, was told to persuade him to return to England; but the exile refused: "Whatever promises of safety may be made, the king would never be able to protect me from the bishops, who believe that no faith should be kept with heretics."

After this Henry Philips, a smooth, treacherous villain in the employ of Stephen Gardiner, came over with Gabriel Donne, a monk of Stratford Abbey, and won the confidence of the simple-minded scholar, who lent him forty shillings. The plans being ripe, the Judas Philips invited the translator out to dinner and then arrested him through the Emperor's attorney, brought from Brussels, and put him in charge of Adolf Van Wesele, Lieutenant of the Castle of Vilvorde, the great state prison of the Low Countries, May 23 or 24, 1535. So skillful, secret, and prompt had been the arrest, that probably no one knew of it till the Emperor's Procureur-General, the terrible Pierre Dufief, came to search Tyndale's chamber and carry off his books, papers, and other effects.

The English merchants, aggrieved by the loss of an esteemed friend and by this treacherous assault on their rights and privileges, wrote to the Queen Regent, Mary of Hungary, entreating her to release Tyndale. King Henry VIII and Cromwell were appealed to, and Cromwell, with the king's consent, wrote to Carondelet, Archbishop of Palermo, and the Marquis of Bergen-op-Zoom, two of the most influential members of the Imperial Government. Poyntz delivered the letters, suffered labor, loss, imprisonment, risked his life for his friend; but it was in vain.

As Paul in prison converted the jailer of Philippi, so Tyndale in prison converted the keeper, his daughter, and

others of his household; and the rest that became acquainted with him said that if he were not a good Christian man, they could not tell whom to trust. Even the Procureur-General called him "a learned, good, and godly man."

A single Latin letter, discovered by M. Galesloot in the archives of the Council of Brabant, written to the Governor of the Castle, Antoine de Berghes, Marquis of Bergen-op-Zoom, is all the autograph we have of this noble man of God; it is as follows:—"I believe, right worshipful, that you are not ignorant of what has been determined concerning me [by the Council of Brabant]; therefore I entreat your lordship and that by the Lord Jesus, that if I am to remain here [in Vilvorde] during the winter, you will request the Procureur to be kind enough to send me from my goods which he has in his possession, a warmer cap, for I suffer extremely from cold in the head, being afflicted with a perpetual catarrh, which is considerably increased in this cell. A warmer coat also, for that which I have is very thin: also a piece of cloth to patch my leggings: my overcoat is worn out; my shirts are also worn out. He has a woollen shirt of mine, if he will be kind enough to send it. I have also with him leggings of thicker cloth for putting on above; he also has warmer caps for wearing at night. I wish also his permission to have a lamp at evening, for it is wearisome to sit alone in the dark. But above all, I entreat and beseech your clemency to be urgent with the Procureur that he may kindly permit me to have my Hebrew Bible, Hebrew Grammar, and Hebrew Dictionary, that I may spend my time with that study. And in return, may you obtain your dearest wish, provided always it be consistent with the salvation of your soul. But if, before the end of the winter, a different decision be reached concerning me, I shall be patient, abiding the will of God to the glory of the grace of my Lord Jesus Christ, whose Spirit, I pray, may ever direct your heart. Amen. W. Tindale."

The doctors of Louvain had thanked Beaton for burning Patrick Hamilton in Scotland, and promised "there shall be those among externe nations which shall imitate the same." Now they had the opportunity to imitate, and they used it. Tyndale was tried for heresy. "It is no great matter, whether they that die on account of religion be guilty or innocent, provided we terrify the people by such examples; which generally succeeds best when persons eminent for learning, riches, nobility, or high station, are thus sacrificed." Such was the sentiment of Ruwart Tapper, Doctor of Theology, Chancellor of the University of Louvain, one of the judges, who was foremost among the accusers of Tyndale, and most relentless in opposition to him. "If they shall burn me, they shall do none other thing than that I look for," Tyndale had said long ago when they were burning his Bibles. "There is none other way into the kingdom of life than through persecution and suffering of pain, and of very death, after the ensample of Christ." Friday, the sixth of October, 1536, he was strangled at the stake and his body then burned to ashes. "He cried," says Fox, "at the stake with a fervent zeal and a loud voice, 'Lord, open the King of England's eyes!'"

Tyndale's dying prayer was heard. At the very time of the martyr's fiery death, the first Bible printed on English soil came from the press; and it was printed by the King's own patent printer Berthelet, or Godfrey. It was a folio of Tyndale's revised New Testament, with his prologues, and his name openly set forth on the title page; it closed with the words: "God saue the Kynge and all his well-wyllers."

Tyndale fought a good fight, he finished his course, he kept the faith, he made good his vow: "I will cause a boy that driveth the plow shall know more of the Scripture than thou doest." When Stokesley, Bishop of London, sneered at the Word of God which every cobbler was reading in his mother tongue, Fox, Bishop of Hereford, replied,

"The lay people do now know the Holy Scriptures better than many of us."

"Evil favored in this world and without grace in the sight of men, speechless and rude, dull and slow-witted" — this is the picture Tyndale paints of himself. Even if true, what of it? Fox calls him "the Apostle of England;" the *North American Review* considers him "the chief of the English reformers;" the *Christian Observer* says, "Few are adequately conscious what an imperishable debt of gratitude is due his memory;" the *British Quarterly* judges him "perhaps the greatest benefactor that our native country ever enjoyed;" Froude writes, his "epitaph is the Reformation."

His admiring countrymen have reared to his memory a cross-crowned lofty and massive monument on Nibley Knoll in Gloucestershire, November 6, 1866, and in 1884 the Earl of Shaftesbury unveiled another in the Thames Embankment Gardens, near Whitehall Court, and the literary grace of Tyndale's Bible is the proud boast of all the educated English-speaking world, "the most splendid literary monument of the genius of our native tongue," as H. W. Hoare writes.

Tyndale's Influence on the Later Versions.

In 1535 or 1536 Miles Coverdale issued the folio "Biblia, translated out of Douche and Latyn into English." "He was especially indebted to Luther's Bible," says Prof. Pattison; and again, "The influence of Luther is very apparent." At Cambridge University Coverdale attended the meetings at the White Horse, called "Germany," because of the Lutheran opinions held there. Later he was twice a Lutheran pastor at Bergzabern, in Zweibrücken, also the Bishop of Exeter. He had a considerable share in the introduction of German spiritual culture to English readers. The first hymns sung by Protestant Englishmen were the forty-one "Goostly Psalmes and Spirituall Songs" which

Coverdale translated from Luther and others, in the original meter, so that they were sung to the original Lutheran melodies. When Bloody Mary became Queen the book was forbidden, to the great loss of English hymnology, as Herford laments.

In 1537 Matthew's Bible appeared. This was Tyndale's Bible, with the untranslated portions of his Old Testament pieced out with Coverdale's translation. The work was done by John Rogers, the literary executor of Tyndale, having been chaplain to the merchant adventurers at Antwerp. About 1536 Rogers went to Wittenberg, became well versed in German, was a pastor there, and prepared the whole Bible for the press of Hans Luft. The work contained a dictionary, a concordance, valuable prefatory matter, and the marginal notes from the first English commentary on the Bible. Hoare writes: "It is chiefly remarkable for the excessive Lutheranism of its annotation, in which it out-Tyndales Tyndale himself," and that it has the "character of a Lutheran manifesto;" he also calls it the first royally authorized English version. John Rogers was the first martyr under Bloody Mary, burned Monday, February 4, 1555; "he has been burned alive for being a Lutheran; but he died persisting in his opinion," wrote Count Noailles, the French Ambassador in London.

Richard Taverner, a London lawyer, the translator of the *Augsburg Confession* and *Apology*, prepared a Bible, based on Matthew's, printed in London in two editions in 1539; it is prefaced by a manly dedication to the King.

The "Great Bible" appeared in 1539. This was Matthew's Bible revised by Miles Coverdale, and since Matthew's Bible was practically Tyndale's work, the old martyr now triumphed gloriously. The "Great Bible" was presented by Coverdale to Archbishop Cranmer, who, in turn, laid it before the King, who "authorized" it and by a specified day had it set up in every church throughout the kingdom and commended by the clergy!

Bonner put six copies in St. Paul's, and was sore distressed to find that people persisted in reading them even during the public services and while the preacher was declaring the Word of God. Crowds would gather around the book, which was chained to a pillar, and there would be eager discussions as to the meaning of the passages read aloud by some scholar who chanced to be present. An inscription on the title page told that "it was oversene and perused at the commandement of the King's Highness by the ryghte reverende fathers in God, Cuthbert bishop of Duresme, and Nicholas bishop of Rochester." And who, think you, was this "Cuthbert of Duresme"? None other than Tunstall, the same Cuthbert who had refused to Tyndale a scholar's room, who had denounced and burned Tyndale's Bible. This Cuthbert Tunstall officially recommended Tyndale's work! Tyndale did not live, labor, and die in vain.

During the six and a half years of the reign of Edward VI, thirteen editions of Bibles and thirty-five of Testaments were published in England. The days of Bloody Mary were not good days for Protestants and Bibles. But when Elizabeth made her entry into London and arrived at "the Little Conduit in Chepe," she was presented with a Bible. Raising it with both her hands, the Queen presses it to her lips, and then laying it against her heart, amid the enthusiastic shouting of the multitude, she gracefully thanks the city for so precious a gift. Three months later, in 1560, came the Geneva Bible, with a dedication "to the most virtuous and noble Queen Elizabeth." For the first time Roman type was used, and the chapters were divided into verses. The monopoly of printing it Elizabeth granted to John Bodley, founder of the famous Bodleian Library at Oxford. Eighty editions appeared.

Lord Bacon writes: "On the morrow of her coronation, it being the custom to release prisoners at the inauguration of a prince, . . . one of her courtiers . . . besought her with

a loud voice, 'That now this good time there might be four or five principal prisoners more released; these were the four evangelists and the Apostle St. Paul, who had been long shut up in an unknown tongue, as it were in prison, so as they could not converse with the common people.''' Very early in Elizabeth's reign, a bill was enacted "for reducing the diversities of Bibles now extant in the English tongue to one settled vulgar, translated from the original." Archbishop Parker planned the work, and the Bishops' Bible appeared in 1568. "The influence of Tyndale is strongly felt," and of the notes it is said "their sturdy Protestantism is often worthy of Luther himself."

The Roman Catholic Rheims New Testament reached England in 1582, followed by the Douay Old Testament in 1609.

In 1611 there appeared King James' version, a revision of the Bishops' Bible, which was practically Tyndale's Bible. Of the Authorized Version the Roman Catholic scholar D. Alexander Geddes writes: "Every sentence, every word, every syllable, every letter and point, seem to have been weighed with the nicest exactitude, and expressed, either in the text or margin, with the greatest precision." The poet Rogers says: "Oh, the exquisite English of the Bible! I often feel as if the translators as well as the original writers must have been inspired." The historian John Richard Green says: "As a mere literary monument, the English of the Bible remains the noblest example of the English tongue, while its perpetual use made it from the instant of its appearance the standard of our language." "In Tyndale's translation we find most of the strength, as well as most of the sweetness of the Authorized Version. . . . There is a graphic simplicity about it which captures the ear at once. . . . The music of Tyndale's translation with equal ease rises to the stately majesty of a march, or falls to the homelike sweetness of a mother's lullaby. The arrangement of words of some sentences is in itself triumphal."

Even the Roman Catholic Faber writes: "Who will not say that the uncommon beauty and marvelous English of the Protestant Bible is one of the great strongholds of heresy in our country? It lives on the ear like music that can never be forgotten, like the sound of church bells which the convert hardly knows how to forego. Its felicities seem to be things rather than words."

"Of the translation itself, though since that time it has been many times revised and altered, we may say that it is substantially the Bible with which we are all familiar. The peculiar genius—if such a word may be permitted—which breathes through it, the mingled majesty and tenderness, the preternatural grandeur, the Saxon simplicity, unequaled, unapproached in the attempted improvements of modern scholars, all are here, and bear the impress of the mind of one man—William Tyndale." (Froude's *History of England*, III: 84.)

"From 1525 to 1884 the best Biblical scholarship of the English nation, not attempting to supersede Tyndale's work, has succeeded only in bringing a matchless work a little nearer perfection. Tyndale's influence in fixing the standard and exhibiting the noble possibilities of the English language has far exceeded that of any other writer. In his English New Testament Tyndale laid the 'grand foundation-stone of England's greatness,' and conferred the greatest of all spiritual blessings on all English-speaking peoples."

"That Tyndale's English is decidedly superior to the writings of his time which have come down to us, cannot be disputed; it is a noble translation, the basis of every subsequent English version, and on several accounts better than all subsequent versions; it has an individuality as pronounced as Luther's, its Saxon is racy and strong, sometimes majestic, and, above all things, it is hearty and true. The reader feels that the translator felt what he wrote, that his heart was in his work, and that he strove in prayer to

reproduce in his own mother tongue to the very best of his ability what he believed to be the true sense of the Word of God, as he understood it."

In our present Bible eighty per cent. of Tyndale has been retained in the Old Testament, and ninety per cent. in the New, and in spite of many revisions, almost every sentence is substantially the same as Tyndale wrote it. No greater tribute could be paid to his industry, scholarship, and genius. To him we owe the exceeding beauty and tender grace of the language of our present Bible. For felicity of diction, and for dignity of rhythm, Tyndale never has been, and never can be, surpassed. Geo. P. Marsh calls it "the first classic of our literature—the highest exemplar of purity and beauty of language existing in our speech. . . . When we study our Testaments we are in most cases perusing the identical words penned by the martyr Tyndale nearly three hundred and fifty years ago."

Dore speaks of Tyndale's "strong Lutheran bias;" Bishop Marsh says "his translation was taken at least in part from Luther's;" Gasquet says: "Luther's direct influence may be detected on almost every page of the printed edition issued by Tyndale, and there can be no doubt that it was prepared with Luther's version of 1522 as a guide;" another writer says: "Happily our own excellent translation of the Bible still retains striking evidence of the influence of his (Luther's) admirable version, and perhaps it is not too much to say that the two most copious and energetic languages are greatly indebted to him (Luther) for their terseness and expression."

WILLIAM DALLMANN.

WHAT RELATION DOES CONTRITION BEAR TO REPENTANCE?

It goes without saying that in the above question "repentance" is not taken in the narrower sense, of contrition, but in the wider sense, of conversion.

Dietrich asks in his Catechism (Qu. 136): "How many parts belong to repentance?" and he answers: "Two: contrition and faith." It were a mistake, however, to infer from this that contrition and faith are, according to Dietrich, two *coordinate* parts of repentance. Considered grammatically, "and" is, indeed, a coordinate conjunction. Yet it does not always connect things logically coordinate. That Dietrich does not regard contrition and faith as coordinate parts of repentance is evident from the preceding question in his Catechism (Qu. 135), where repentance is defined as follows: "Repentance is the conversion to God, by faith in Christ Jesus, of a poor sinner, who has a knowledge of his sins by the Law and experiences sorrow for them." Here, evidently, contrition and faith are not coordinated, but contrition is, both grammatically and logically, *subordinated* to faith. The preponderance of faith in repentance—in Dietrich's mind—is indicated still more plainly by the construction of this sentence in the German original, which, if imitated in English, would make the sentence read: "Repentance is a poor sinner's, who has a knowledge of his sins by the Law and experiences sorrow for them, conversion to God by faith in Christ."¹) To remove all doubt in the matter, we call attention to the fact, that this definition is not the first one that Dietrich gives, but the second one. The first one reads thus: "Conversion is nothing more nor less than this, that a poor sinner turn to God through faith in Jesus Christ, after he has, by the Law of God, been led to

1) "Die Busse ist eines armen Sünders, der seine Sünden aus dem göttlichen Gesetz erkannt hat und darüber Leid trägt, Bekehrung zu Gott durch den Glauben an Christum."

know his sins and to grieve over them.”¹⁾ Could the paramount importance of faith in a man’s repentance be asserted more strongly? We fail to see how it could.

In the light of these utterances, it is not difficult to see the true meaning of Qu. 136: “How many parts belong to repentance? Two: contrition and faith.” This does not mean: Contrition and faith are coordinate parts of repentance, are on a perfect level or anything approaching thereto; it simply means: Both contrition and faith are requisite unto true repentance; he that has not contrition is not truly penitent, and he that has not faith is not truly penitent; for it takes both contrition and faith to make a person truly penitent. But why? Why does it take both contrition and faith to make a man penitent? Simply because faith is not possible without contrition. Only a contrite sinner can believe. Faith is the soul of repentance, contrition is a necessary prerequisite of faith.—This is Dietrich’s doctrine.

Now, what saith the Lord? What does the Bible teach regarding this matter? Let us consult the Bible.

The Bible requires all men to repent. Acts 17, 30: “And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent.” The Bible declares repentance necessary unto our salvation. Acts 3, 19: “Repent ye therefore and be converted that your sins may be blotted out when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord.” 2 Pet. 3, 9: “The Lord . . . is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.”

The Bible also tells us what repentance is, wherein repentance consists. Luke 15, 1. 2 we read: “Then drew near unto Him all the publicans and sinners for to hear Him. And the Pharisees and scribes murmured, saying: This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them.” Hereupon Jesus spoke unto them the parable of the lost sheep and added

1) “Die Busse is nichts anders, als dass sich ein armer Sünder zu Gott bekehrt durch den Glauben an Jesum Christum, nachdem er durch das Gesetz Gottes seine Sünde erkannt und bereut hat.”

(v. 7): "I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance." So just persons need no repentance, but sinners do. And a sinner's repentance is accomplished when he comes to Jesus, v. 1. To repent is to come to Jesus.

How does a man come to Jesus? Jesus tells us that Himself in unmistakable terms. He says John 5, 40: "Ye will not come to me that ye might have life." Compare with this the parallel statement, v. 38: "Whom He hath sent, *Him ye believe not.*" To come to Jesus is to believe Him, which is tantamount to believing in Him. Compare also vv. 44. 46. 47, and the entire context.—So, then, to come to Jesus is to believe in Him.

Now, before a sinner can come to Jesus, or believe in Him, he must undergo another experience. He must see and acknowledge his sins and experience true sorrow for them. He must realize that he is a sinner, Rom. 3, 23, that he has merited wrath and punishment, that he is, in fact, already under the wrath of God, and that eternal damnation awaits him, Eph. 2, 3b. John 3, 36b. Matt. 25, 41. 46a; that he is a lost and condemned creature, that he has absolutely no power to save himself, that he is utterly helpless, being dead in sins, Eph. 2, 1. And the knowledge of this deplorable condition he is in must alarm him, must frighten, must terrify him, must fill him with sorrow. He must be broken-hearted, he must be contrite. Ps. 51, 17: "The sacrifices of God are a *broken* spirit; a *broken* and a *contrite* heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise." Luke 23, 40: "Dost thou not *fear God*, seeing thou art *in* the same *condemnation?*" 2 Cor. 7, 8: "For though I made you *sorry*, etc., I perceive that the same epistle hath made you *sorry.*" This experience, we say, the sinner must undergo, before he can come to Jesus. This knowledge of one's sins, fraught with fear of God, in view of His wrath and punishments, this true and sincere sorrow of the heart, is called, Matt.

21, 32, *repentance*—repentance in the narrower sense. In the Greek text it is called μεταμέλεια, which denotes a change of mind.—How is this change of mind effected? It is effected by the Law. Rom. 3, 20: “By the Law is the knowledge of sin.” The divine Law, which is not an empty sound, but the voice of the holy and righteous God, discloses to the sinner his sin and the righteous wrath of God and works in him a lively knowledge of these things, a knowledge that affects the heart and makes it tremble. This operation of God’s Law in a sinner’s heart is commonly called *contrition*. “Contrition is the true and sincere sorrow of a heart which, on account of its sins, as disclosed by the divine Law, is terrified and distressed in view of the wrath of God and His righteous punishments.” (Dietrich, Qu. 138.)

Now whereunto is contrition necessary? Is contrition the vehicle that takes a man to heaven? Is it the rope that draws him up to God? Is it the hand wherewith he lays hold upon the rope? By no means. No sinner has ever been saved by contrition. No sinner has ever been brought a hair’s breadth nearer to God by contrition. The vehicle and rope that draws and conveys a sinner to God is Jesus Christ, or, we may say, the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The hand that lays hold on this rope is faith, faith alone. Eph. 2, 8: “By grace are ye saved *through faith*.” Mark 16, 16: “He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved; he that *believeth not* shall be damned.”

Well, whereunto is contrition necessary? Contrition is necessary that one may believe, that one may have faith. Matt. 21, 22: “For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not; but the publicans and harlots believed him: and ye, when ye had seen it, *repented not afterward, that ye might believe him*” (οὐδὲ μετεμέληθητε ὕστερον, τοῦ πιστεῦσαι αὐτῷ = ye repented not afterward, to = [in order to] believe him).

To be sure. How shall a person see his Savior, before he has come to see his sin? How shall he desire the help

of that blessed Physician, before he feels distressed? How shall he stretch out his hand for salvation before he has realized his damnation? Before a person can believe in the Savior, he must see and feel his need of Him. That is the purpose of contrition, to show the sinner his need of a Savior, to show the sinner his sin and his lost condition, in order to awaken in him a desire for help and salvation, that he may go to the Savior and believe. Thus saith the Lord Matt. 21, 32. Compare also Gal. 3, 22: "The Scripture hath concluded all under sin, *that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.*" Luther writes in his *Commentary on Galatians*, expounding ch. 3, 19: "Paul answereth therefore to this question: If the Law do not justify, to what end, then, serveth it? Although, saith he, it justify not, yet it is very profitable and necessary. For, first, it civilly restraineth such as are carnal, rebellious, and obstinate. Moreover, it is a glass that showeth unto a man himself, that he is a sinner, guilty of death, and worthy of God's everlasting wrath and indignation. To what end serveth this humbling, this bruising and beating down¹⁾ by this hammer, the Law I mean? To this end, that we may have an entrance into grace. So, then, the Law is a minister that prepareth the way unto grace. For God is the God of the humble, the miserable, the afflicted, the oppressed and the desperate, and of those that are brought even to nothing: and His nature is to exalt the humble, to feed the hungry, to give sight to the blind, to comfort the miserable, the afflicted, the bruised and broken-hearted, to justify sinners, to quicken the dead, and to save the very desperate and damned. For He is an almighty Creator, making all things of nothing. Now that pernicious and pestilent opinion of man's own righteousness, which will not be a sinner, unclean, miserable, and damnable, but righteous and holy, suffereth not God to come to His own natural and proper work. Therefore God

1) Latin: *contritio*.

must needs take this maul in hand (the Law I mean) to drive down, to beat in pieces, and to bring to nothing this beast, with her vain confidence, wisdom, righteousness, and power, that she may so learn at the length by her own misery and mischief, that she is utterly forlorn, lost, and damned. Here, now, when the conscience is thus terrified with the Law, then cometh the doctrine of the Gospel and grace, which raiseth up and comforteth the same again, saying: Christ came into the world, not to break the bruised reed, nor to quench the smoking flax, but to preach the Gospel of glad tidings to the poor, to heal the broken and contrite in heart, to preach forgiveness of sins to the captives, etc. (Is. 42, 3. Matt. 12, 20.)" (Luther on the Galatians, London, MDCCLX.)

The same will be seen from the parable of the Pharisee and the publican. Both of these men went up into the temple to pray. But only one of them was justified: the publican, v. 14. How was he justified? By faith. (Rom. 3, 28.) The publican had faith, he trusted in God's mercy, for he prayed, "God be merciful to me." The Pharisee did not trust in God's mercy, he "trusted in himself that he was righteous," as his prayer plainly shows and as the Savior also expressly says, v. 9. Why did the Pharisee trust in himself? Why did he not trust in his God and Savior, as the publican did? Because he had no knowledge of his sins, because he was not contrite, because he did not abase himself, v. 14. (Observe the contents of his prayer.) He was exalted with the pride of self-righteousness, and hence saw no need of a Savior. The publican, however, was contrite: he saw his sins, as disclosed to him by the Law of God, he called himself "a sinner;" he was ashamed of his sins, he "would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven;" he was sorry for his sins, for "he smote upon his breast;" he was broken-hearted in view of the wrath and punishment he had deserved and was subject to. He saw that he was a lost and condemned sinner, that he was utterly helpless, that noth-

ing but sheer mercy could save him. He saw and felt his need of a merciful God and Savior, and thus it was that he could be led by God to desire the Savior's help and to receive it by faith, faith in the heavenly Mercy-seat, the true *ἑλσστήριον*. Thus he was justified by faith, by faith alone; not by contrition, not by faith *and* contrition, but by faith alone, Rom. 3, 28. But his contrition paved the way for his faith. And thus he was truly penitent, thus he was come to Jesus.

This conception of contrition is warranted by the whole plan and structure of Holy Writ. The Bible consists of the Law and the Gospel. The Law works contrition, the Gospel works faith. Now the Law and the Gospel are not co-ordinate parts of the Bible. The Gospel predominates. The Gospel is the nucleus, the soul of the Scriptures. The real content of the Scriptures is Christ Jesus. John 5, 39. Acts 10, 43. John 5, 46. Acts 26, 22. 23. Now the Law does not breathe a word about Jesus Christ. It leaves that entirely to the Gospel. The Law is not coordinated with, it is subordinated to, the Gospel. The Law serves the Gospel. The Law bruises the sinner's heart, makes it contrite, that the Gospel may bind it up and heal it. Jer. 23, 29, coll. Is. 61, 1. The Law terrifies in order that the Gospel may console. 2 Cor. 7, 8. 9. Gal. 3, 24. Hence they that are come to Christ "are not under the Law but under grace," and the word of grace. Rom. 6, 14. Gal. 3, 25. The Law begets a race of bondsmen, the Gospel transforms these bondsmen into freemen. Gal. 4, 24—26. And this is the very end and aim of the Scriptures, to make us free through faith in Christ Jesus. Gal. 5, 1. (*Finis intermedius*.) From this it follows again: Faith is the soul of repentance, contrition is a necessary prerequisite of faith.

That contrition must not be coordinated, must not be placed on a level, with faith, or anything approaching thereto, is evidenced also by the following: Contrition may exist, and, in fact, it often does exist, in a person all by it-

self, *i. e.*, apart from faith. But in that case contrition is not repentance, nor is it any part thereof, however small. Such contrition is not an actual beginning and first part of repentance, needing only to be supplemented by faith to make the repentance complete, but such a contrite person is utterly impenitent. Look at Judas. Judas "repented himself" (μεταμεληθεὶς), when he saw that Jesus was condemned. But was Judas penitent? Did he repent in the wider sense of the word, either in whole or in part? By no means. Judas went and hanged himself out of sheer contrition! Contrition, true contrition, does not become an ingredient of repentance until coupled with faith.

On the other hand, he that has faith has repentance, not a part of repentance but repentance. Concede that a man has faith and you concede his repentance. "*Qua (sc. fide) posita, ponitur conversio.*"

If a man could have faith without contrition, he would be saved without contrition. Contrition is not necessary *per se*, but as a necessary prerequisite of faith. Contrition plows up the hard soil of the human heart, so that the seed of the Gospel can be sown into it and bear the fruit of faith. If a farmer could sow his wheat and raise and reap his crops without plowing his fields, he would surely do so. But under the conditions that generally prevail this cannot be done. Plowing is a necessary prerequisite of sowing and reaping. Even so it is with the *contritio cordis*.

He that would be saved by contrition *per se*, either in whole or in part, seeks to be saved by the Law, for contrition is wrought by the Law. "But that no man is justified by the Law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, The just shall live by faith," Gal. 3, 11. Even the Gospel, when it makes a person sorry for his sins—and what Christian is not made sorry when he contemplates the suffering and death of his Savior, as described to him in the Gospel?—even the Gospel is then not performing its own peculiar office, its saving work proper, but it is doing the work of

Moses and the Law, preparing the way for itself, "preparing the way unto grace," making ready the heart to receive the seed of faith. (Compare *Formula of Concord*, Part II. Ch. V, § 12. 13. Müller, pp. 635. 636.)

So, then, it is evident from the Scriptures that contrition and faith are not coordinate parts of repentance, but contrition is, and of necessity must be, subordinated to faith. Faith is the *domina*, contrition the *ancilla*. Faith is the soul of repentance, contrition is a necessary prerequisite of faith.

Such is also the teaching of the Lutheran church. Let us glance at our Confessions. In its first and fundamental confession, the so-called *Augustana*, the Lutheran church declares: "Repentance consists properly of these two parts. One is contrition, or terrors stricken into the conscience through the acknowledgment of sin: the other is faith, which is conceived from the Gospel, or absolution, and believes that for Christ's sake sins be forgiven, and comforts the conscience, and frees it from terrors."¹) Note that according to the *Augustana* both contrition and faith are indeed necessary unto true repentance. For "repentance consists properly of these two parts. One is contrition . . . the other is faith." But note furthermore that according to the *Augustana* contrition and faith are not coordinate parts, but contrition is clearly subordinated to faith. For contrition is wrought by the Law. For it is wrought "through the acknowledgment of sin," and "by the Law is the knowledge of sin," Rom. 3, 20. That is the end and aim of the Law, and that is as far as the Law goes. Faith "is conceived from the Gospel." And the purpose of faith, and hence of the Gospel, is, not to increase the sinner's sorrow or to make his contrition real and genuine, but, rather, to "comfort the (troubled) conscience and free it from terrors." The purpose of faith is to obtain for the contrite

1) *Augustana*, XII, 3—5. Decorah Edition.

sinner remission of sins and *thus* to make his contrition salutary. Thus the work of the Law, contrition, is preliminary work and a necessary preparation for faith, the work of the Gospel. Faith is the soul of repentance, contrition is a necessary prerequisite of faith.

The *Apology* says (XII, 2): "This is the proper voice of the Gospel, that by faith we obtain remission of sins."¹⁾ What is the proper voice, or message, of the Gospel? Not that by faith we be made contrite, or our unreal and inadequate contrition be made real and adequate,—the Law is supposed to have finished that work,—but that, having been made truly and genuinely contrite by the Law, we, by faith, obtain the remission of sins: *this* is the proper voice of the Gospel.

Again the *Apology* says: "Here, if one should ask why Saul, Judas, and like persons do not obtain grace, being horribly contrite—here they ought to make reply from faith and from the Gospel: Because Judas did not believe, did not raise himself up on the Gospel and promise of Christ. For faith constitutes the difference²⁾ between the contrition of Judas and that of Peter."³⁾ So Saul and Judas did not lack contrition either in kind or degree; they were "horribly contrite." What they lacked was faith. Hence their contrition, genuine and deep though it was, was of no benefit to them.

Again: "We, therefore, add the other part of repentance, *i. e.*, faith in Christ" (and declare) "that in these terrors" (= contrition, see *Augustana*, XII, 4, quoted above) "the Gospel of Christ must be held before the conscience, wherein forgiveness of sin is promised gratis for Christ's sake. They must, therefore, believe that for Christ's sake their sins are freely forgiven. This faith lifts up, sustains,

1) Translated from the Latin of Müller's Edition.

2) "*Discrimen ostendit.*" Compare the German: "*Der Glaube unterscheidet die Reue Petri und Judae.*"

3) *Apology*, XII, 8. Translated from the Latin.

and vivifies the contrite, according to Rom. 5, 1: "Being justified by faith, we have peace." This faith obtains remission of sins. This faith justifies in the sight of God, as the same passage testifies: "Being justified by faith." This faith shows the difference between the contrition of Judas and that of Peter, between that of Saul and that of David. For this reason Judas' or Saul's contrition is of no benefit (*non prodest*), because it is unattended by this faith (*quia non accedit ad eam haec fides*), which grasps the remission of sins offered (*donatam*) for Christ's sake. For this reason David's or Peter's contrition is salutary (*prodest*), because it is attended by faith, which grasps the remission of sins offered for Christ's sake."¹) According to the *Apology*, the difference between the contrition of Saul and Judas and that of Peter and David was this: David's and Peter's contrition was attended by faith; Saul's and Judas' contrition was unattended by faith. For this reason contrition, in the case of Peter and David, was salutary, while in the case of Saul and Judas it was of no avail—*non proderat*. The difference, in as far as it proved fatal, was not a difference in kind or in degree of intensity, but merely a difference *in concomitantiis*, the contrition being attended in the one case by faith and in the other by despair.

It has been urged by some that contrition, to be genuine and adequate, must proceed from the love of God; that Judas, *e. g.*, was not truly contrite and hence could not believe, because he did not love God. But that is the leaven of Antichrist. Says the *Apology*: "Our adversaries reply from the Law and say that Judas did not love God, but feared the punishment. But when shall a terrified conscience—especially in those great, serious, and genuine terrors that are described in the Psalms and the prophets, and which they experience (*degustant*) who are truly converted (*convertuntur*)—be able to judge whether it love God for His

1) *Apology*, XII, 35—37.

own sake or whether it flee" (German: "fleuhet und hasset") "from the eternal punishments? These great emotions may be distinguished in letters and words; *in praxi* (*re ipsa*) they cannot be thus torn asunder (*divelluntur*), as the easy-going sophists imagine."¹) "From contrition we cut off those idle and endless disputations as to when we grieve out of love for God, and when out of fear of punishment. We say that contrition is genuine terrors of a conscience which feels that God is angry with sin, and which is sorry it has sinned. And this is the way such contrition comes to pass: when our sins are reproved by the Word of God."²) "In these pains and terrors, they" (our adversaries) "say, a man merits grace, if so be that he love God. But how shall a man love God in actual terrors, when he experiences the horrible and ineffable (*inexplicabilem humana voce*) wrath of God?"³) No, neither faith nor love must enter into contrition to make it genuine. Contrition is simply a necessary prerequisite of faith, which is the soul of repentance, while love is a fruit thereof.

Apology (XII, 50 f.): "1 Sam. 2, 6: 'The Lord killeth and maketh alive: He bringeth down to the grave and lifteth up.' The one (dual statement in this passage) signifies contrition, the other signifies faith. And Is. 28, 21: 'The Lord shall be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon, that He may do His work, His strange work; and bring to pass His act, His strange act.' (Latin: *Dominus irascetur, ut faciat opus suum. Alienum est opus eius, ut operetur opus suum.*) A strange work of God he calls it, when He terrifies, because God's proper work is to make alive and to comfort. But He terrifies for this reason, says he, that there may be room for consolation and vivification, because to secure hearts, and to such as perceive not the wrath of God, consolation is loathsome." Compare also the following: "In a similar manner, the examples of the saints also show these two parts" (of repentance). "Adam is upbraided, after sin-

1) *Apology*, XII, 8. 9.2) *Ibid.*, XII, 29.3) *Ibid.*, XII, 34.

ning, and terrified; *this was contrition. Thereupon*¹⁾ (*postea*) God promises grace, says a Seed shall come, by which the kingdom of Satan, death, and sin, shall be destroyed; here He offers remission of sin."²⁾ In like manner we read: "Thus David is upbraided by Nathan, and, terrified, he says (2 Sam. 12, 13): 'I have sinned against the Lord.' *This is contrition. Hereupon*³⁾ he hears the absolution: 'The Lord hath put away thy sin, thou shalt not die.' 'This word lifts David up and sustains him by faith, justifies him, and makes him alive. . . . This is the other part of repentance (German: Das ist nu das andere *fürnehmste* Stück der Busse, nämlich der Glaube), faith, which lifts up and consoles."⁴⁾

Again: "About this special faith we are contending; and we place it over against that opinion which bids us confide, not in the promise of Christ, but in the *opus operatum* of *contrition*, confession, and satisfactions, etc. This faith so follows the terrors that it overcomes them and pacifies the conscience."⁵⁾

Finally we read: "In the second place we reckon our adversaries will confess that the remission of sins is a part, or the end, or to speak after their fashion, the *terminus ad quem*, of repentance. Consequently that by which remission of sins is accepted is rightly added to" (= numbered among) "the parts of repentance. (German: Darum dasjenige, dadurch Vergebung der Sünden erlangt wird, soll und muss je ein *fürnehmest* Stücke der Busse sein.)"⁶⁾ So remission of sins is accepted, not through contrition, but through faith. Through repentance we receive remission of sins, and the remission of sins is the end and aim of repentance, the *terminus ad quem*. Compare Luke 24, 47.⁷⁾ Now if contrition and faith were coordinate parts of repentance, we could hardly escape the inference that remission of sins is obtained, in part at least, through contrition, or

1) Italics our own. 2) *Apology*, XII, 55. 3) Italics our own.

4) *Ibid.*, XII, 56. 57.

5) *Ibid.*, XII, 60.

6) *Ibid.*, XII, 63.

7) *μετάνοιαν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.*

for contrition's sake, which the *Apology* regards as equivalent to saying that remission is obtained by our works, or that a man is justified by the Law. See *Apology*, XII, 75. 76: "In the third place, our adversaries say that sin is forgiven in this wise: because attrition or contrition elicits the act of loving God; by this act it deserves to receive remission of sins. This is simply teaching the Law, and destroying the Gospel and abolishing the promise of Christ. For they require nothing but the Law and our works, since the Law demands love. Besides, they teach us to trust that we shall obtain forgiveness of sins on account of our contrition and love. What is that but putting our trust in our works and not in God's Word and promise of Christ? But if the Law be sufficient to obtain remission of sins, what is the need of the Gospel, what is the need of Christ, if for our works' sake we obtain remission of sins? We, contrariwise, call the consciences back from the Law to the Gospel and from trusting in their own works to trusting in the promise and in Christ, because the Gospel exhibits Christ unto us and promises remission of sins freely for Christ's sake. In this promise it bids us trust, that for Christ's sake we are reconciled with the Father, not for our contrition's or love's sake. For there is no other mediator or propitiator than Christ. Neither can we do the Law, except we first be reconciled through Christ. And if we did do aught, yet we must hold that not for such work's sake, but for Christ, the Mediator and Propitiator's, sake we obtain forgiveness of sins."

Enough, enough! Both the Scriptures and our Confessions teach that repentance consists of two parts: contrition and faith. But neither of them regards contrition and faith as coordinate parts of repentance. Clearly and emphatically they declare that faith is the soul of repentance, and that contrition is merely a necessary prerequisite of faith.

J. A. RIMBACH.

THE PASTOR IN HIS WORK.

NOTE.—In the preceding article on this subject, published in the July issue of the *QUARTERLY*, a transposition unhappily occurred in the printing. The article ought to begin with the first paragraph on p. 183.

III. Administration of the Sacraments.

In the work of a pastor the administration of the sacraments is next in importance to the preaching of the Gospel. This is evident from the relation which they bear to the Word of God. The Word of God is in them and makes them means of grace through which the Holy Ghost works. Baptism is "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost," and instituting His Supper the Lord says, "For the remission of sins." To those who are already in the faith the sacraments are seals to strengthen them in the assurance of grace and forgiveness. Abraham "received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of faith," Rom. 4, 11. The sacraments being means through which souls are brought into the kingdom of Christ and by which they are nourished unto eternal life they belong to the chief treasures over which the pastor is made a steward, and he will assuredly be held responsible for the manner in which he has dealt with these *media salutis*.

To come up to his duty in this respect the pastor must be diligent, both in the pulpit and elsewhere, to carefully instruct the people on the nature, use, and benefit of the sacraments, and how they ought to be received. A thorough instruction of old and young on this subject is all the more necessary because of the woeful ignorance of the great mass of our American people with regard to the right doctrine of the sacraments. Our sectarians and churchless people do not know what the sacraments are, and for what purpose they have been instituted. Many ten thousands know, when they join the church they must be baptized, and that is all they do know about Baptism. And as to the Lord's Supper they have no idea what it is and what it is

for. And there are not a few who are called Lutherans with whom a similar ignorance is found.

This deplorable state of things is by no means surprising. The ministers of the various denominations do themselves not know the Scripture doctrine on the sacraments. When whole assemblies of denominational divines can solemnly declare that the Lutheran church teaches consubstantiation, this is certainly a strong testimony of great ignorance. How are those to teach the people who themselves are in the dark? When preachers habitually minimize the importance of the sacraments and cry out against "sacramentarianism"—whereby they mean the receiving of grace in and through the sacraments—we may not wonder that so many count it an indifferent thing whether they are baptized or ever receive the Lord's Supper. Why is it that our country, which is called a Christian land, is so full of unbaptized persons? One chief reason is because neither the parents nor the children have ever been instructed on the necessity and usefulness of this sacrament. When preachers pronounce the sacraments nothing more than external ceremonies, or, at best, outward signs of inward grace; when a preacher after administering Baptism to an infant can turn to the parents and say, "Now you must not think that this will do the child any good," it is no wonder that the people have no veneration for these sacred institutions.

Frequently preaching on the sacraments a Lutheran pastor should not content himself with presenting the doctrine in general terms. He will do well to enter into details, showing both what the peculiar object of each sacrament is and what specific comfort it gives. The grace offered in the sacraments is the same which is offered in the word of the Gospel, and if the people are to appreciate the sacraments, if they are not to count them a more or less superfluous addition to the Word preached, if they are not to regard them something not so very necessary, the

preacher must set forth their special usefulness and the particular assurance which they convey. When we were once speaking to a Methodist of the high esteem with which we Lutherans regard the Communion, he remarked, "I think it fully sufficient for the salvation of my soul if I hold the merits of Christ in a living faith, and I do not see why I should also eat Him with the mouth in the sacrament." This man gave expression to an idea which is quite common and which can be met and remedied only by expatiating on the distinctive usefulness and the specific assurance which is characteristic of the sacraments.

We wish here to insert the following words of Martin Chemnitz: "To the attacks and clamors of the fanatics we properly reply from the Word of God, that the sacraments, which God Himself instituted to be aids of our salvation, can in no way be considered either useless or superfluous, nor can they safely be neglected or despised. It is impious to despise that without which piety cannot be perfected. But this must be diligently explained from the Word of God, in order that the true doctrine may be rightly understood and the right use of the sacraments may be appreciated and fervently loved." And further on he says: "God who is rich in mercy, that He might show and commend the riches of His goodness unto us, desired to exhibit His grace to us not in one way only, by the mere Word, but also to aid our infirmity by certain helps, namely, by the institution of the sacraments which are annexed to the Gospel promise." (Ex. Conc. Trid., P. II, canon V.)

The present articles not being intended for dogmatical dissertations, but only to show the pastor in his work we append some practical remarks on the administration of *Baptism*.

The essence of Baptism being the immersing of a person in water, or the applying of water to the person, in the name of the Holy Trinity, the words: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy

Ghost," should be spoken with a distinct voice and in an impressive manner, so that to the auditors these words are made the most prominent thing in the whole act. Self-evidently the words must never be altered. Even such variations which do not affect the essence of the sacrament are to be avoided. In saying this we do not mean to contend that using the formula: "I baptize thee in the name of the Holy Trinity," without naming the Persons, would invalidate Baptism, but there is no scriptural warrant for the use of such a formula. Instituting this sacrament the Lord named the three persons of the Godhead individually, and a departure from this form is therefore not justifiable. The formulas, in the name, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι, and into the name, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, are both scriptural, Acts 10, 48. Matt. 28, 19, hence both allowable. Herein the pastor should accommodate himself to the usage of the church in which he officiates, and should then constantly use the same form.

The opinion that the formula: "I baptize thee in the name of Christ," might properly be used rests on a misapprehension of Acts 2, 38: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." This passage does not say that the apostles used this form of words in the act of Baptism. Peter's words were the answer to an inquiry of the multitude. When those people who had been received into the covenant of God by circumcision and many of whom had, doubtless, been baptized by John, asked, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter replied, they should now be baptized into this faith that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, seeing He was crucified and is risen again, and, "being by the right hand of God exalted, hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." Peter told the people they should repent of their sins and should receive this new sacrament of the New Covenant. The mode and the words in and with which Baptism is to be administered did not at all

come into consideration, and to so construe the words as to make them imply that the apostles in the act of baptizing used the formula: "I baptize thee in the name of Jesus Christ," is both doing violence to the connection in which the passage is found, and is against John 14, 26. The Spirit whom the Lord sent and of whom He said, "He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you," could not prompt the disciples to change the form of Baptism which they had received so recently.

When the words of institution are preserved unchanged in letter and sound, they must also be used in their proper meaning. When the pastor who administers Baptism, and the people with whom it is administered, use and understand the words as meaning that the Father alone is God, and that the Son and Spirit, however high, are not equal with the Father, then the act is performed in the name of another god than the God of the Bible, and hence it is not Christian Baptism and is not valid. A Lutheran pastor can therefore not acknowledge baptisms which have been performed by Antitrinitarians. Though they preserve the sound of the words, yet by putting a foreign meaning into them they deny the divinity of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and what they do is blasphemy and not Christian Baptism. Unitarians, Universalists, Campbellites, Seventh Day Adventists, Quakers, Mormons, and some other small sects do not believe in the Triune God, and their baptisms are not actually performed in His name. When such as have been members of an Antitrinitarian sect are received into the Lutheran church, they must be baptized, because they have never yet received Christian Baptism. Besides the organized sects named there are some liberal, rationalistic, broad-gauge congregations with regard to which the doctrine prevailing publicly among them must be examined into carefully to determine whether their baptisms can be recognized. But the Baptism performed in denominations

that teach wrong concerning the nature and the effect of this sacrament, but use the words of institution in their proper meaning, is valid in whatever way, shape, or form it may have been administered.

To baptize requires water, and the word βαπτίζεν will not admit of the use of any other element. Substituting another element for water is not baptizing. Yet if a small quantity of a strange element, such as salt, lime, perfume, is contained in the water, this will, as a matter of course, not invalidate the sacrament. But neither impure nor perfumed water should be used in this sacred rite. The pastor should see that limpid water is provided, and in baptizing infants it is well to have it lukewarm.

As to the mode of Baptism, which has been the subject of so much contention in Christendom, the Lutheran church occupies a very liberal standpoint. The Lutheran will recognize every Baptism in which water has been used with the words of institution. However, as a minister of the conservative Church of the Reformation, the Lutheran pastor will be set against the two extremes. He will not sanction too scant a use of water and he will always reject the idea that to be a true Baptism the whole body *must* be buried in water. We once saw a Presbyterian minister sprinkle a very little water with the tips of his fingers at a distance of fully a yard from the infant, so that it seemed doubtful whether a single drop actually touched the child. This is certainly spiritualizing Baptism with a vim. When a boy, we saw an aged preacher on a cold winter day wade into a creek from which thick cakes of ice had been removed to baptize two women, one of whom took to her bed the day following and remained there for seven long years. The same Dunkard preacher refused to baptize a dying young man who begged for it with tears, for no other reason than because he could not be immersed. These are samples showing to what extremes men will be carried by fanaticism. Agreeably to the custom prevailing in our Lutheran church

the person administering this sacrament fills the hollow of his hand well with water and applies it to the forehead by pouring or washing.

When a Lutheran minister presents his doctrine on the mode of Baptism he is very apt to be asked the question, whether he would baptize by immersion if requested to do so. In answering this question regard should be had both to existing circumstances and to the character of the interlocutor, Prov. 26, 4. 5. In these days when Immersionists are so numerous and so audacious, a Lutheran pastor will naturally be loath to express any willingness to immerse. Yet as the mode of baptizing belongs to the category of adiaphora it must be said that *per se* there would be nothing wrong in a Lutheran minister's granting a request for immersion. *Aliis paribus*, i. e., if resident Lutherans were not offended, if Gal. 2, 4 would not come into consideration, and if the request were made for right reasons, it would be perfectly proper for a Lutheran to baptize by immersion.

Many on hearing the doctrine preached that Baptism is necessary for the regeneration and salvation of children, because they are born flesh of the flesh, are quick to conclude that the Lutheran church condemns all infants which die unbaptized. Therefore every pastor should be ready both publicly and privately to state the position which the best Lutheran theologians have always held on the question of the salvation of unbaptized infants. Those born in the church, which would have been brought to Baptism had they lived, certainly are not to be condemned, as little as the infants dying before the eighth day under the Old Covenant. But as to infants born outside of the church, which never, or perhaps never, would have been baptized, a Lutheran pastor should withhold all judgment beyond what St. Paul says: "What have I to do to judge them also that are without? Do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth," 1 Cor. 5, 12. 13. The judgment over the infants of the infidels belongs not to us

but to God, who is both rich in mercy and whose righteousness is like the great mountains. If a minister wishes to express any further opinion, he should give it only as his own personal belief and not as the teaching of the Scriptures.

On this subject Dr. M. Luther says: "Who would doubt that the infants in Israel which died before the eighth day uncircumcised were saved through the prayers of their parents and the promise that He would be their God? We likewise say that God has not so bound Himself to His sacraments that without them He would not be able in some other way, not known to us, to save the unbaptized infants. Under the law of Moses He saved many (also kings) without law, as Job, Naaman, the kings of Niniveh, Babylon, Egypt, etc. Nevertheless, He would not have His Law despised openly, He wanted it kept, threatening the punishment of everlasting curse. Even so do I hold and hope that the thoughts of the good and gracious God are good over against those children who are deprived of Baptism without their fault and without despising His revealed command. Yet, on account of the world's wickedness, He does not and did not will that this should be publicly preached and believed, lest all which He has ordained and commanded be despised." In the following paragraph Luther goes on to say: "Therefore those children with and over whom are the sighs, wishes, prayers of believing Christians must not be straightway condemned, like others with whom are not the faith, prayer, and sighing of Christian and believing persons." (See Luther's *Comfort to Pious Women*, etc., § 6.)

This position holds forth sweet comfort to a pious mother whose infant has died before it could be baptized, and yet it leaves a great responsibility on all parents concerning the Baptism of their infants, and this responsibility should be pressed home. A pastor who will not see to it that all the children in his parish are brought to Baptism

is not deserving of the name Lutheran. Also on neighboring churchless people the pastor may and ought to urge the duty of having their children baptized and of sending them to a Christian school or Sunday school, and frequently this may be made a strong mission argument. Of course children are not to be baptized against the will and without the consent of the parents or guardians, but the necessity of Baptism and the duty of parents must invariably be insisted on, not only because of the responsibility falling on parents, but especially also because of the great blessing which a baptized infant may bring to a house.

When it is uncertain whether a person has been baptized or not, and no certainty can be obtained, the sacrament should always be granted. Neither should it then be administered in a qualified form, as: If thou wast not baptized before I now baptize thee, because this might render the present Baptism dubious to the mind of the applicant.

Baptism as a solemn act should be performed with due solemnity. Never should the pastor go through with it in a perfunctory manner; for thereby it loses much in edification to the parents and other witnesses. And the proper place for the performing of Baptism is the church, and the proper time, the time of public worship, that it may serve for the edifying of all.

F. KUEGELE.

CHRIST'S ATTITUDE TOWARD ERROR AND ERRORISTS.

Indifferentism and unionism are two prominent traits of the Church of our times. In constantly widening circles pure doctrine is viewed as a matter of little importance, while error in doctrine is deemed an innocent trifle. We are constantly told in our day that the Christian who differs from us in religion merely sees truth from a different standpoint, and that we should not deny him the right hand of

fellowship on account of this doctrinal difference. This sentiment threatens to deluge the Church. It is published from thousands of pulpits and bruited in numberless papers. Preachers of different churches form ministers' unions, exchange pulpits, and officiate together at funerals. The members of different sects hold union services, commune at strange altars, and unite in religious endeavors. This practice is praised as a proof of true Christian charity. Those Christians, however, who insist on pure doctrine and warn against error and teachers of error are very unpopular. They are reproached and even derided. They are called sticklers for orthodoxy and narrow sectarians. They are told that their conduct is inconsistent with the spirit of the gentle and meek Galilean who said: "Judge not: condemn not!" Thus the champions of "union" would make it appear that our Master was tolerant toward error and teachers of error. But that is a gross misrepresentation. Our blessed Redeemer's relation to error and teachers of error was just the reverse of what they would make it appear. His true attitude is plainly set forth in the Gospels. In these days of indifferentism and consequent unionism it will surely be well to ponder His attitude often. Let us first consider His attitude toward error, and, in the second part of this paper, His attitude toward errorists.

1. CHRIST'S ATTITUDE TOWARD ERROR.

In the days of our Lord there were three sects, or parties, in Palestine, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes. The latter lived in retirement near the Dead Sea; and it is nowhere recorded that Christ came in contact with them and their errors. With the Sadducees, however, who mingled more with the people and were represented in the Sanhedrim and especially in the service of the temple, Christ came into public conflict on two occasions. This Jewish sect denied the resurrection. That was their leading error. But although the Sadducees were largely men of rank and

of wealth, their error did not meet with favor and acceptance among the people in general. It was strongly combated by the popular and intensely patriotic party of the Pharisees. But while the Pharisees clung to the doctrine of the resurrection, they falsified a number of other Scripture truths. They corrupted both the formal and the material principle of true religion. They added to the Word of God by their traditions, and took away from it by their restricted interpretation.

The Sermon on the Mount presents several samples of their corrupt interpretation of the divine Law. Their traditions are frequently referred to in the Gospels. One of the most highly prized of these man-made traditions prescribed the proper observance of the Sabbath. According to this tradition it was unlawful to heal on the Sabbath or to carry any kind of burden, because both acts involved servile labor. For the same reason it was prohibited to pluck ears of corn on the Sabbath and to rub them in the hands, since the act of plucking the ears was regarded as a form of reaping, and the act of rubbing them as a form of threshing. Another tradition prescribed the washing of hands before meals and other religious ablutions. Besides these, there were other commandments of men which the Scribes and Pharisees had received to hold, Mark 7, 4. 8. They taught that these human additions to the divine Law were binding on all; nay, they even placed them above the divine Law, inasmuch as they taught that, whenever these oral traditions came into conflict with a written commandment of God, the former were to be obeyed and the latter to be set aside, Matt. 15 and Mark 7. The person who transgressed these traditions was considered a sinner, the man who observed them was counted a saint. This Pharisaic perversion of the formal principle naturally led to a perversion of the material principle, to a corruption of the doctrine of justification. Concerning this cardinal doctrine of Scripture the Scribes and Pharisees taught that they were

able to keep all the commandments, and merited life by their own righteousness.

These are some of the principal errors with which Christ came into contact. Now, what was His attitude toward these errors? If we are to believe a late evangelist, His method of dealing with error was to largely ignore it, letting it melt away in the warm glow of the full intensity of truth expressed in love. Teaching the truth was, indeed, the principal part of His work. He said unto Pilate: "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." But to bear witness unto the truth is already a rebuke of error. However, Christ did not merely rebuke error by implication, He rebuked it also expressly and openly. He opposed error in thought, word, and deed. He did not, indeed, go out of His way to find matter for controversy; but He neither evaded nor ignored erroneous teaching. He boldly faced, exposed, and denounced it wherever He met it. He bore witness against it in His majestic discourse on the mountain. In this marvelous sermon He exposed the false Pharisaic interpretation of the divine Law, and also opposed the Pharisaic idea of righteousness. Nor was this the only occasion on which He antagonized error; He pursued the same method to the close of His public career; in fact, most of His conflicts with error occurred in the last year of His ministerial life. His first recorded attack on Jewish tradition was made in Jerusalem, about nine or ten months after the beginning of His ministry in Judea. He was attending the unnamed feast of the Jews, John 5, 1, which was probably Purim (March 19, 782 A. U. C.). At the pool of Bethesda He found a poor paralytic. He cured him, commanding him to rise, take up his bed, and walk. But it was Sabbath on that day. This was only one of seven cures which He wrought on the Sabbath. (See Mark 1, 21; 1, 29; 3, 1. John 9, 14. Luke 13, 14; 14, 1.) The fact that He chose the Sabbath for performing these cures is worthy of note.

It shows that He intended to openly exhibit His condemnation of the traditional Sabbath; and the inspired records show that He succeeded in this. (For further Sabbath controversies see Matt. 12, 1—8, and parallel passages.) His attitude of antagonism to traditionalism was perhaps never more pronounced than in His crushing reply to the Scribes and Pharisees of Jerusalem who censured Him for permitting His disciples to eat bread with defiled, that is to say, with unwashed hands. (Matt. 15 and Mark 7.) This was shortly after His return from the Passover mentioned John 6, 4, about one year before His crucifixion. In this reply He openly denounced traditionalism in stern and strong words. He declared that the traditions of the elders were the commandments of men, that the observance of these man-made commandments is a vain worship of God which often involves a direct and gross violation of God's holy will. And when His disciples, at the first opportunity after this denunciation, expostulated with Him on the danger incurred by His attack on Pharisaic precepts and principles, He answered and said, "Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up." (Matt. 15, 13.) This statement exhibits most plainly our Savior's position with respect to every erroneous doctrine. He regarded false doctrine as a weed which His heavenly Father has not planted. Hence it has no right of existence. He deems it His duty to pluck it up by the roots, to destroy it completely and utterly. (For Christ's refutation of the Pharisaic idea of righteousness see Matt. 5, 20. Luke 17, 10; 18, 9—14, and other passages. His encounter with the error of the Sadducees is recorded Matt. 22, 23 sqq., and parallel passages.)

Such was the attitude which our Savior assumed and maintained toward error in doctrine—an attitude of implacable hostility. But why did He set Himself in open opposition to false doctrine? Why did He expose, assail, and condemn it? What was the motive of His remorseless

antagonism to error? It cannot have been love of strife that prompted Him to take this position. Such a motive was utterly foreign to His pure and peace-loving soul. Neither should this motive be found in the hearts of His followers, for it is an utterly unworthy motive, and only serves to make friends for false doctrine. But while the great Prince of Peace was not a polemic from choice, He opposed error because He knew that error in doctrine is a dangerous thing. He looked upon it as noxious or harmful. About seven or eight months before His crucifixion and death He said to His disciples in the parts of Dalmanutha, "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees." (Matt. 16, 6.) Here He bids them beware of the *doctrine* of the Pharisees and Sadducees, v. 12, of their *false* doctrine, of course. (See Matt. 23, 2. 3.) He likens their false doctrine to leaven. This figure implies that false doctrine is a corrupt and corrupting thing. Leaven is a piece of sour dough which is in a state of putrefaction. It is, therefore, a sign of impurity and corruption. (1 Cor. 5, 7. 8. Lev. 2, 11.) By comparing false doctrine to leaven, therefore, Christ characterizes it as a distinctly impure and corrupt thing. But this does not exhaust His meaning. Leaven is also a corrupting substance. It comes out of corruption, and corrupts that with which it is mingled. "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." (Gal. 5, 9.) The microscopic yeast plants in the piece of sour dough are in continual motion. Under favorable circumstances they multiply with extraordinary rapidity and quickly pervade the whole lump, changing it into their nature. Even so the leaven of error grows and develops most rapidly. It propagates itself with amazing rapidity. It penetrates and pushes through till it pervades, and so corrupts the holy bread of Scripture truth on which our souls are fed. Therefore, take heed and beware of leavenous doctrine. Beware of even a single false doctrine, be it ever so small; for "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." Moreover, false doctrine also

spreads itself with a corrupting effect through the heart that admits it. Look at the Pharisees and Sadducees. The leaven of their error caused their hearts to swell and inflate with spiritual pride. It led them to trust in themselves as being righteous, and to despise others. It blinded them to the deep depravity of their whole nature and to their need of a redeemer and of regeneration. It led them to reject and persecute Christ, the only Redeemer, and to die in their sins. That was the effect, the fearful and fatal effect, of their leavenous teaching. Indeed, erroneous doctrine is not a harmless thing, as many imagine. It is a most dangerous, pernicious, and ruinous thing. It injures and ruins the soul which admits it. No wonder, therefore, that our blessed Redeemer who died for our souls opposed all error in doctrine, and earnestly cautions us to take heed, and beware of the leaven of false doctrine.

Having considered Christ's attitude toward error, we will now proceed to consider His attitude toward teachers of error.

2. CHRIST'S ATTITUDE TOWARD ERRORISTS.

In order to understand our Redeemer's position in relation to teachers of error properly, it is necessary to bear in mind that there are two general classes of errorists, viz., conscious and unconscious teachers of error. The first and worst class of false teachers consists of such as consciously turn from the known truth and stubbornly hold to their error. They knowingly encourage and propagate their corrupt doctrines, and wittingly deceive and destroy simple souls. Alas, there are many such teachers of error, Tit. 1, 10. 11; 3, 10. 11. But there are also many who propagate error in ignorance. They are ensnared in the errors of their denomination; but their intentions are honest. They do not make it a point to deceive others, but are rather deceived themselves and blindly follow their leaders without really knowing what they are doing, like those two hundred men

who followed the rebellious Absalom in their simplicity, 2 Sam. 15, 11. (See also the Preface to the Book of Concord, p. 16 sq.) This does not, of course, justify their teaching of error, neither does it render their error innocuous. Error is ruinous, no matter by whom it is taught. But while this circumstance does not neutralize the effect of their false teaching, it places their act in the catalogue of unconscious sins.

These two classes of errorists were found also in Israel in the days of our Savior. And Christ took into account the different spirit of these false teachers and modified His method of dealing with them accordingly. We use the word "modified," for though Christ antagonized all errorists without exception, He treated the one class with mildness, and handled the other with deserved severity. But even in His treatment of the latter there was a perceptible progress.

In the third chapter of John we have an account of Christ's conversation with a man of the Pharisees. This interview occurred on the occasion of our Lord's attendance at the first Passover after His baptism. Nicodemus belonged to the sect of the Pharisees; he was also a member of the Sanhedrim and a teacher of Israel. And being a Pharisee, he was, of course, a false teacher. However, he evidently belonged to the better portion of his party. He came to Jesus as an honest inquirer, sincerely desiring to receive information concerning the kingdom of heaven. How did our Lord treat him? He treated him kindly, but He did not connive at his errors. Although Nicodemus was a great and good man in the sight of his countrymen, Christ tells him again and again that he must be born anew, otherwise he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. By reminding him of his inborn corruption Christ opposed his Pharisaic idea concerning the way into the kingdom and rebukes his work-righteousness. Nevertheless, this reproof is a gentle reproof, clearly showing that Christ took into account the spirit of this false teacher.

Our Savior's relation to the other class of false teachers is clearly defined in the Sermon on the Mount. Toward the close of that marvelous sermon He says to His hearers: "Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, inwardly, however, they are ravening wolves." This picture of ravenous wolves who cover themselves with the skins of sheep that they may come near to the flock and thus catch the sheep, is evidently a description of *conscious* deceivers, of teachers who *know* that they are false prophets, and *purpose* to deceive and destroy simple souls with their errors. They disguise themselves, put on a deceptive appearance, and thus hide their true nature and character. This plainly implies that they are aware of being false prophets; for no one disguises himself without really knowing that he has something to conceal and without being conscious of the purpose to deceive. Does the wolf who covers himself with the skin of a sheep know that he is a wolf? Even so these false prophets know that they are false prophets. Do ravenous wolves know why they wish to come near to the sheep? Even so these false prophets know why they wish to come near to the sheep of the Good Shepherd. Do rapacious wolves know that the sheep will recognize them and escape if they come to them openly? Even so these false prophets know why they must hide their real nature by donning the garb of true prophets. Again, in one of the following verses, v. 19, our Lord points to the doom of the false prophets. He says, in effect, that *every-one* of these pseudo-prophets shall perish. It is evident, therefore, that Christ is *here* warning against conscious deceivers.

Such radical errorists were doubtless to be found among the teachers of Israel at the time when our Savior uttered this warning—about nine or ten months after His baptism—, for He speaks in the present tense: "which come to you," *ἐρχονται*. He does not mention them by name in this warning; but we know whom He means, the Scribes

and Pharisees, who had already begun to reject knowledge and to harden their hearts. They had heard His divine preaching and had witnessed His wonderful works during the eight months of His ministry in Jerusalem and Judea, John 2, 13—5, 47. But they did not believe Him. They *would* not come to Him. They hated and persecuted Him, because He had broken their Sabbath by healing the poor paralytic who had lingered thirty-eight years, unpitied and friendless, at the pool of Bethesda. They formed the fearful resolve to kill this beneficent Savior, not only because He had thus broken their Sabbath, but also because He had said that God was His own (*ἰδὼν*) Father, making Himself equal with God, John 5, 18. When He left Jerusalem shortly after this incident, some of these Scribes and Pharisees followed Him wherever He went, Luke 5, 17, to collect charges against Him. Shortly after this departure from Jerusalem, while on His journey to Galilee, He was passing through a field of grain with His disciples. These Jerusalem spies, who dogged His footsteps everywhere, condemned His disciples for plucking ears of grain on the Sabbath. (Matt. 12, 1 sq., and parallel passages.) The Master, however, defended the act of His followers, completely refuting the objection of their accusers. The malignant emissaries were silenced; but their hostility deepened. On one of the following Sabbaths our Lord was teaching in a synagogue in the interior of Galilee; and there was a man whose right hand was withered. And the Scribes and Pharisees watched Him, whether He would heal on the Sabbath day, that they might find an accusation against Him. But He knew their thoughts. He opposed and refuted these malicious teachers of error by word and deed. Commanding the man with the withered right hand to arise and stand forth in the midst, He said unto them, "Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath days, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill?" But they were silent. They were convinced and convicted. They knew and felt in their hearts that it was lawful to heal the man on

the Sabbath; but they would not admit it; they would not give God the praise, but willfully hardened their hearts. A strange mixture of feeling now filled the Lord's heart—indignation and grief. Looking round about on them indignantly, being greatly grieved for the hardness of their heart, He said unto the man, "Stretch forth thine hand!" And he stretched it out: and his hand was restored whole as the other. The Scribes and Pharisees were now filled with madness. They went forth from the synagogue and took counsel against Him, how they might destroy Him, destroy Him who had broken their Sabbath by—an act of mercy.

Our Lord spent the greater portion of the last six months of His life in Perea. One day a certain Pharisee in Perea requested Him to dine with him, Luke 11, 37 sq. This was one of three invitations to dine with a Pharisee, the other two being recorded Luke 7, 36 and 14, 1. Our Lord did not decline the invitation. He was not a monkish man. To His pure, loving soul, which sought to promote the good of even His enemies, these entertainments, at which He would meet other Pharisees, were important opportunities which He improved for their benefit. But neither on this nor any other occasion did He by commission or omission make the impression of sanctioning or ignoring their errors or of fellowshiping with them as brethren in the faith. On the contrary, He treated them as false teachers and opposed them as well as their errors. When He entered the house of that Pharisee, He purposely omitted their ritual washing of hands before meal. When His host was astonished at this, our Lord severely reproached him and his Pharisaic companions, denouncing six successive woes upon them. The entertainment was broken up. The guests left the house; and when Jesus was come out from thence, the Scribes and the Pharisees began to urge Him vehemently, and to provoke Him to speak of many things: laying wait for Him, and seeking to catch something out of His mouth, that they might accuse Him.

Our Lord's last encounter with false teachers took place in the temple. (Matt. 22 and 23.) This was on Tuesday in Passion week, and it marked the close of His public career. The spies of the Pharisees and Herodians tempted Him with the perplexing and dangerous question, whether it was lawful to give tribute to Caesar, or not. His answer astonished them. They left Him in silence. Then the Sadducees came with their captious, insidious question concerning the resurrection. He told these proud, aristocratic freethinkers that they erred and knew not the Scriptures, and completely confuted them by His appeal to the Scriptures and to the power of God. They were reduced to silence. He had literally gagged and muzzled them—ἐξέψωσεν. The multitude was astonished, and even certain of the Scribes said unto Him, "Master, Thou hast well said" (καλῶς = excellently, beautifully). One of these Scribes then asked Him which were the greatest commandment. There is no evidence to show that he propounded this question in malice. On the contrary, it is said that he answered Christ's question discreetly, *i. e.*, understandingly. And the Lord, taking into account the spirit of the questioner, said unto him: "Thou art not *far* from the kingdom of God," Mark 12, 34. Then He began to catechise the Scribes and Pharisees about the Messiah, making a last effort to lead them to a belief in His divinity. However, His question, 'If David, then, call Him Lord, how is He His Son?' received no reply. St. Matthew says, "No man was able to answer Him a word; neither durst any man from that day forth ask Him any more questions," Matt. 22, 46. The Master had silenced them, silenced them in every encounter. He had again and again defeated them in argument. Their only argument was calumny, violence, and force: Kill Him! Crucify Him! That was their only hope of silencing this hated Rabbi of Nazareth.

While His obstinate enemies are silent, He opens His lips and within hearing of all the people says unto His disciples, "Beware of the Scribes!" Luke 20, 46. Now fol-

lows His last and most solemn warning to the Scribes and Pharisees who had opposed Him and His blessed work to the last. A most awful warning it is! The Divine Teacher who had opened His Sermon on the Mount with eight benedictions, now pronounces eight woes on the Pharisees. "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in. . . . Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" Matt. 23, 13—33. These are stern, awful, withering words. Someone has said: "Literature may be searched in vain for philippics more terrible than those which constitute Christ's last public address in the Temple." These woes are a fearful foreboding of the wrath of the Lamb, Rev. 6, 16. But let us remember that they are woes, *i. e.*, exclamations of sorrow as well as expressions of holy wrath. The Lord grieves over these errorists while He denounces them. For is He not their Savior also? Has He not suffered and died for them too? Because He thus cares for their souls, He uses these cutting words, as a surgeon uses the knife to save the life of his patient. Because He loves their immortal souls, He leaves nothing untried to turn their hard hearts to repentance, to recover them out of their errors, and to bring them to the knowledge and confession of the full truth.

Let us learn from our blessed Redeemer what attitude to assume and maintain toward teachers of error. Let us boldly oppose them, caution against them, and, if need be, denounce them severely; but let us do this in love, with a burning desire to save them. Let mercy and love be our motive. It is the only method that wins. No man will receive rebuke save from such as he knows to be full of love toward him and are seeking his welfare. Hence Paul says to Timothy: "The servant of the Lord must not strive"—quarrel, wrangle, fight—, "but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness—ἐν πραΰτητι—instructing

those that oppose themselves; if God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth," 2 Tim. 2, 24. 25. This motive of mercy and meekness will also prevent the employment of force and of violence. Luther—the man who so sternly inveighed against error and teachers of error—says in his reply to Duke Henry of Brunswick (1541): "In the tenth place, no one can deny that we abstain from shedding blood, murdering, hanging, and taking revenge, though we might often have done this, and even now might do it; but as Christ, the Apostles, and the ancient Church did, even so we tolerate and admonish our enemies and pray for them, also publicly in the church, in litanies and sermons, precisely as Christ, our Lord, did and taught." (See also the essay entitled: "Luther, der Lebensretter Carlstadts," in *Lehre und Wehre*, vol. 36, No. 9, p. 286 sq.) In the preface to the Book of Concord the confessors say most solemnly: "Wherefore we also herewith testify in the sight of God the Almighty and of all Christendom, that . . . we abhor and heartily detest the tyranny of the persecutors, neither do we in any wise want to be guilty of that blood, which without doubt will be required from the hands of the persecutors on that great day of the Lord before the solemn and severe tribunal of God." (Mueller, p. 17.)

However, the fact that in all our opposition to error and teachers of error we exhibit a spirit of meekness and mercy will not render us and our attitude popular. Our Master was hated and finally crucified, despite His pity and love. They chose the robber and rebel and red-handed murderer rather than Christ who had sought to redeem them from error and ruin eternal. Still, His witness was not altogether in vain. He won Nicodemus; He won Joseph of Arimathea, and many others among the chief rulers. Even so our witness will and must succeed; for "Truth is mighty, and will prevail."

C. F. D.

SERMON COURSES FOR THE ADVENT SEASON.

As in the Lenten, so in the Advent season we have special week day evening services in the Lutheran church. When, owing to circumstances, these services cannot be held on an evening during the week, they are held on Sunday evenings of these seasons. In the Reformed churches—and with the Reformed we class all Protestants that do not follow Luther in their religious tenets—Lent and Advent are not observed. In these churches the preacher is justified in ignoring these seasons altogether, no texts are prescribed, and, if he chooses to do so, he may preach on the birth of Jesus Christ on the day of His resurrection. But in the Lutheran church we not only have our prescribed texts in the pericopes of each Sunday in the year, but we also observe the Lenten and the Advent seasons. How is this to be accounted for? Why do the different denominations of a Reformed type ignore these seasons, while we Lutherans observe them? The reason is this. When Luther seceded from the papacy and instituted the order of service for the Church of the Reformation, he was not as hasty and inconsiderate as were Zwingli, Calvin, and other Reformed leaders when they severed their connection with the Roman pontiff. The Reformed leaders were actuated by the principle to do away with everything that might in the remotest way remind them of the Church of Rome. Hence it is that we see no altar, no crucifix, no candles, no pictures, no statues, no cross, no clerical robes in these Reformed churches that have strictly followed their Reformed leaders. Some of them are so radical as not even to tolerate a musical instrument within the sacred precincts of the sanctuary. No embellishment whatever is permitted in the place of worship which is not even called a church, but simply a meeting house.¹⁾ But Luther was very careful not to go to extremes.

1) The Anglican or Episcopal church is an exception. Calvinistic in doctrine, it does not follow the Reformed leaders in their radical measures to do away with old established customs against which no objection can

How vigorously did he oppose those rioters in Wittenberg who thought that they were helping the good cause of the Reformation by demolishing the images of the saints in the churches during his involuntary retirement at the Wartburg. He came to Wittenberg in defiance of the Elector's command that he should remain secreted at the Wartburg, and preached against these fanatics every day for a whole week until order was restored. Luther's principle was to retain in the Church all those things which are conducive to edification and do not conflict with the Word of God. Hence it is that in the Lutheran church we not only have altars, pictures, candles, etc., but have also retained the pericopes and the observance of the different seasons to which the people had become accustomed since olden times.

Now what is the great subject to be discoursed upon in the Advent season? The four weeks of Advent are intended for preparation in view of the great festival of our Lord's nativity. The hearts are to be prepared for the reception of the good tidings to be proclaimed on Christmas Day that the Savior is born. This cannot be done in a better way than by setting forth the promises of God in the Old Testament in which He has predicted the coming of the Deliverer of the fallen race and by calling attention to the longing and desire of God's children in the time of the Old Dispensation for the Promised One to come into the flesh. There is a threefold advent of Christ: His coming into the flesh, His coming on the last day, and His coming into our hearts. Any of these three advents may be discoursed upon in the Advent season. The Gospel of the First Sunday in Advent suggests to us to speak of His advent in our hearts, and that of the Second Sunday in Advent directs us to dwell upon His advent in the clouds. But the proper subject to be treated in the Advent evening services

be raised on Scriptural grounds. Seasons and festivals are observed in this church. But it is not free from the residues of Romanism. (See THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, vol. IV, p. 280.)

is His advent in the flesh as promised, prefigured, foreshadowed, or touched upon in the writings of the Old Testament. The fact should be impressed on the minds that Christ, who is Alpha and Omega in the Scriptures, is to be found everywhere in the Old Testament.

As to sermon courses for the evening services in Advent the following arrangements are submitted.

I. PROMISES AND INDICATIONS.

- a. GEN. 3, 15. *The first promise concerning the Savior.*
 1. That He shall be the Seed of the woman.
 2. That He shall bruise the serpent's head.
- b. GEN. 22, 15—18. *The second promise concerning the Savior, that in Abraham's Seed all the nations of the earth shall be blessed.*
 1. Who is Abraham's Seed?
 2. What is meant by the blessing?
 3. How or by what means did Abraham's blessing come upon the nations?
 4. Who are they that are blessed by Abraham's Seed?
- c. GEN. 49, 16—18. *The words of the dying patriarch Jacob, "I have waited for Thy salvation, O Lord!"*
 1. The meaning of these words in Jacob's mouth.
 2. In what sense a Christian can and shall say these words.
- d. PS. 2, 12. *The words of David, "Kiss the Son."*
 1. The meaning of these words.
 2. What the kissing of the Son implies.

II. MEN THAT WERE TYPES OF CHRIST.

- a. DEUT. 18, 15. *Jesus Christ the Prophet like unto MOSES.*—Christ and Moses are alike:
 1. As founders of dispensations.
 2. As mediating between God and the people.
- b. NUM. 13, 16. JOSHUA *a type of the Lord Jesus.*
 1. In his obedience.
 2. In his deeds for God's people.
- c. JUDGES 13, 24, 25. SAMSON *a type of the Lord Jesus.*
 1. In his birth, name, and title.
 2. In his superhuman strength.
- d. 2 SAM. 23, 1—3. DAVID *a type of the Lord Jesus.*
 1. In historical resemblance to Jesus.
 2. In special personal characteristics.

III. PREFIGURATIONS.

- a. GEN. 28, 10—14. *Jesus the LADDER reaching to heaven.*
 - 1. Proof that the ladder which Jacob beheld in his dream was to prefigure Jesus the Messiah.
 - 2. Points of comparison between that ladder and the Messiah.
- b. NUM. 24, 17—19. *Jesus the Messiah promised as a STAR AND SCEPTER.*
 - 1. As a Star to illustrate His glory.
 - 2. As a Scepter to illustrate His dominion.
- c. JUDGES 6, 36—40. *The Messiah prefigured in the story of GIDEON'S FLEECE.* He is prefigured:
 - 1. In His coming into the world.
 - 2. In His reception by the world.
- d. IS. 11, 1. 2. *The Messiah pictured as a BRANCH and a ROD.*
 - 1. As a Branch in respect of His person.
 - 2. As a Rod in respect of His office.

IV. DESIDERATUS GENTIUM.

- a. PS. 14, 7. *How the believers in the time of the Old Testament wished for the Messiah to come.*
 - 1. Upon what they based this wish.
 - 2. Why they so fervently wished for Him to come.
- b. PS. 119, 174. *The salvation for which they longed in the time of the Old Testament.*
 - 1. What the salvation was for which they longed.
 - 2. Who longed for this salvation.
- c. IS. 64, 1. 2. *How they craved for the Messiah in the Old Testament.*
 - 1. For a Messiah from heaven.
 - 2. For a Messiah for all people.
- d. GEN. 49, 16—18. See I, c.

V. PREDICTION, PRAISE, AND PROMISE.

- a. PS. 40, 7. *Christ's coming in the flesh predicted in the volume of the book.*
 - 1. Which is the volume of the book.
 - 2. How Christ's coming in the flesh is predicted therein.
- b. PS. 118, 25. 26. *Hosanna and praise to the Son of David in the Old Testament.*
 - 1. The hosanna with which His faithful people addressed Him.
 - 2. The praise with which they blessed Him.
- c. IS. 59, 20. *The Redeemer promised to Zion.*
 - 1. Who the Redeemer is.
 - 2. What His redemption is.

VI. THE MESSIAH IN SOLOMON'S SONG.

- a. SOL. SONG 2, 8—13. *Christ's coming into the world and His address to the believing soul.*
 - 1. His coming into the world.
 - 2. His address to the believing soul.
- b. SOL. SONG 5, 9—13. *The personal excellence of the Lord Jesus Christ who came into this world to save us.*
 - 1. He is true God and therefore mighty to save.
 - 2. He is also true man and was thereby enabled to perform the work of our redemption.
- c. SOL. SONG 5, 15, 16. *The loveliness of the Messiah as to mind and speech.*
 - 1. His loveliness as to His mind.
 - 2. His loveliness as to His speech.
- d. SOL. SONG 8, 14. *The desire for the Messiah to come.*
 - 1. As expressed in the Old Testament by the saints.
 - 2. As expressed in the New Testament by the true believers.

VII. PROMISES AT DIFFERENT PLACES.

- a. In paradise (Adam and Eve).
- b. On the plains (Abraham, Sarah, and the three angels).
- c. In the desert (Moses and Miriam).
- d. In the palace (David).

VIII. THE MESSIAH LIKENED TO FLOWERS AND TREES.

- a. The rose of Sharon. Sol. Song 2, 1.
- b. The lily of the valley. Ibid.
- c. The olive tree. Hos. 14, 6.
- d. The fir tree and the myrtle. Is. 55, 13.

IX. GRADUAL REVELATION.

The Savior was promised:—

- a. to the whole human family, Gen. 3, 15;
- b. to a single race, Gen. 9, 26;
- c. to a particular nation, Gen. 12, 3;
- d. to a special family, 2 Sam. 7, 12.

“Very gradual was the revelation of redemptive truth to man. God’s first communication was like the evening star, serene and solitary; the fuller communications of the patriarchal age were like the starry hosts at night; the revela-

tions made to Moses were like the fair and full-orbed moon, in which that of the stars is lost; and those made by succeeding prophets were like the dawn of day, when the moon grows pale and dim; and the supreme revelation was like the radiance of the sun shining in noontide splendor."

H. SIECK.

Book Review.

Sermons on the Gospels of the Ecclesiastical Year. *By Henry Sieck. Part Second. St. Louis, Mo., Concordia Publishing House. 1904. 187 pages. Cloth cover. Price, 85 cts.*

This book contains short sermons (about six pages each) for all the Sundays from Trinity Sunday to the Twenty-seventh Sunday after Trinity, and for St. Michael's Day, Reformation Day, and Thanksgiving Day. We heartily recommend these sermons as pure in doctrine, lucid in arrangement, and simple in style.

F. B.

Sunday. *Translated from the German of Rev. C. M. Zorn by J. A. Rimbach. St. Louis, Mo., Concordia Publishing House. 1904. 16 pages. Price, 5 cts.*

This tract contains four parts. The first explains the following words of the Augsburg Confession: "The Scripture, which teacheth that all the Mosaical ceremonies can be omitted after the Gospel is revealed, has abrogated the Sabbath." The second, the words: "For they that think that the observation of the Lord's day was appointed by the authority of the Church, instead of the Sabbath, as necessary, are greatly deceived." The third part enlarges on the following words of the same confession: "And yet, because it was requisite to appoint a certain day, that the people might know when they ought to come together, it appears that the [Christian] Church did for that purpose appoint the Lord's day: which for this cause also seemed to have been pleasing, that men might have an example of Christian liberty, and might know that the observation, neither of the Sabbath, nor of another day, was of necessity." The fourth part contains the Lutheran and Scriptural explanation of the Third Commandment of our Lutheran Catechism.

F. B.